

## REMARKS


Claims 1, 13-14, 17-22, 35-39 and 64 remain pending in this application. Claims 2-12, 15-16, 23-34, 40-63 and 65-66 have been cancelled, without prejudice. New claims 67-80 are added herewith.

The Office Action dated January 10, 2008 rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants continue to believe that this rejection is unwarranted, however, for all of the reasons set forth in the Pre-Appeal Request for Review filed on June 3, 2008. Nevertheless, the claims have now been amended to more clearly define the invention. The enablement rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejected the claims over the Ferguson reference on the basis that the claims of Ferguson and the claims of this application were the same. Applicants continue to believe that this rejection is also unwarranted, however, for all of the reasons set forth in the Pre-Appeal Request for Review filed on June 3, 2008. Here again, though, the claims have now been amended to more clearly define the invention, and these claims clearly distinguish over the claims of Ferguson. In fact, the only claim that the Examiner indicated was the same as the claims of Ferguson – claim 41 – has now been canceled from this application. Thus, the rejections over Ferguson should be withdrawn.

This application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David B. Cochran  
Reg. No. 39,142  
JONES DAY  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 586-7029